

REMARKS

Claims 32-61 are pending, with claims 32, 50 and 60 being the independent claims. By this Amendment, claims 32, 50, and 60 have been amended.

The Examiner rejects claims 32-60 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,719,749 to Schweikert et al. (“Schweikert”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner relies upon Schweikert to anticipate teach or suggest each and every feature defined by claims 32, 50, and 60. This rejection position is incorrect for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 32, 50, and 60, as amended, recite ““the proximal end of each distal single-lumen tube being permanently and directly connected to the distal end of the multi-lumen tube portion, without a hub.” At least this feature, in combination with the other features recited in independent claims 32, 50, and 60, is not taught or suggested by Schweikert.

Fig. 1 of the present application and Fig. 1 of Schweikert are reproduced below.




Fig. 1 - Present Application




Fig. 1 - Schweikert

In the present application, the multi-lumen tube portion 12 of the catheter 10 is connected to distal extension tubes 18 and 20 without the use of a hub. This connection creates a smooth transition between the multi-lumen tube portion 12 and the distal extension tubes 18 and 20, which facilitates the passing of the catheter 10 through a subcutaneous tunnel 102 during implantation of the catheter in a patient by a reverse tunneling procedure.

In contrast, Schweikert discloses a catheter 20 having first and second lumens 22, 23 that are indirectly joined to extension tubes 38, 39 through the use of a hub 24. The hub 24 is permanently sealed around the catheter 20 and extension tubes 38, 39. There is not a direct connection between ends of the first and second lumens 22, 23 and ends of the extension tubes 38, 39. Moreover, the hub 24 is not passable through a subcutaneous tunnel along with the distal end of the catheter as would be required in a reverse tunneling procedure.

Therefore, Schweikert does not teach or suggest the “the proximal end of each distal single-lumen tube being permanently and directly connected to the distal end of the multi-lumen tube portion, without a hub,” as required in independent claims 32, 50, and 60.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 32, 50, and 60 are patentable over Schweikert, and kindly request that that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the various objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action is respectfully requested.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge \$940, which covers the \$130 fee for a one (1) month extension of time and the \$810 fee for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), to Deposit Account Number 01-1785.

Authorization is also given to charge any outstanding amount or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 01-1785.

Respectfully submitted,

AMSTER, ROTHSTEIN & EBENSTEIN LLP
Attorneys for Applicants
90 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10016
(212) 336-8000

Dated: New York, New York
May 27, 2009

By: /Brett M. Pinkus/
Brett M. Pinkus
Registration No. 59,980